



Otay Ranch
Preserve Owner/Manager (POM)
Preserve Management Team Meeting
January 23, 2009




Agenda

- Call to Order
- Approval of Meeting Minutes
- Public Comment on items not related to Agenda
- Status Reports
- Finance
- Proposed Policy Committee Agenda
- Next Preserve Management Team Meeting
- Adjournment


IV.A.1. Future Infrastructure

- 114 acres total
 - Brookfield Shea (41 acres)
 - Otay Ranch Company (73 acres)
- Mediation scheduled for February 25th



IV.A.2.a. Access through other Public Agency lands

- 606 acres total
 - Otay Ranch Company (376 acres)
 - McMillin Companies (230 acres)



IV.B.1 Future POM Alternatives

▪ Background

- Otay Ranch Preserve Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) implements current POM Structure
- JPA and Phase 2 RMP state that the JPA is to be reviewed every 5 years
- PMT and the Policy Committee, at their last meetings, directed POM staff to explore future POM alternatives and the pros/strengths and cons/risks of each

Future POM Alternatives *(cont'd)*

▪ Future POM Alternatives

- Existing POM
- USFWS manages lands east of Otay Lakes and within the NWR boundary/Determine appropriate POM for remainder of conveyed preserve lands
- Third Party POM
- Jurisdictional POMs:
 - **Option 1:** Each jurisdiction is responsible for implementing POM tasks and responsibilities as outlined in the RMPs on conveyed preserve land within their respective jurisdiction.
 - **Option 2:** Each jurisdiction is responsible for implementing POM tasks and responsibilities as outlined in the RMPs on conveyed preserve land associated with a development project within their respective jurisdiction.

Future POM Alternatives *(cont'd)*

▪ Existing POM

- Implemented by the JPA
- County and City have joint responsibilities for management and monitoring of the Preserve
- JPA establishes the PMT
- JPA establishes the Policy Committee
- Funding collected through CFDs or similar funding mechanism
- Currently, the County invoices the City for administrative, operational, and monitoring tasks

Future POM Alternatives *(cont'd)*

▪ USFWS manages lands east of Otay Lakes and within the NWR boundary/ Determine appropriate POM for remainder of conveyed Preserve lands

- Per the "Baldwin Agreement":
 - USFWS agreed to have lands east of Otay Lakes and within the NWR boundary transferred to USFWS
 - These lands total ~6,200, of which ~1,100 acres are currently owned and/or being managed by USFWS or CDFG
 - USFWS will be relieved of RMP obligations
 - Funding for management and monitoring of the transferred lands will be at no cost to Otay Ranch projects

**USFWS manages lands east of Otay
Lakes and within the NWR
boundary/Determine appropriate
POM for remainder of conveyed
Preserve lands *(cont'd)***

- County and City to determine appropriate POM for remainder of conveyed preserve lands
- Funding source for the remainder lands is identical to the existing POM structure

Future POM Alternatives *(cont'd)*

▪ **Third Party POM**

- Responsible for all POM tasks, i.e. resource protection, monitoring and management, environmental education, research, recreation, and enforcement activities
- Funding source identical to existing POM structure except Third Party POM to invoice the City and the County (once development has been built in the unincorporated County) for operational, management, and monitoring costs

Future POM Alternatives *(cont'd)*

▪ Jurisdictional POMs, Option 1

- Preserve divided based on jurisdictional lines
- County and City responsible for implementing RMP tasks and insuring POM responsibilities are completed for all conveyed preserve lands within their respective jurisdiction
- Funding source identical to existing POM structure
- County and City will need to come to agreement on a per acre rate for management and monitoring costs of conveyed preserve lands (rates to vary based on location and specific management and monitoring needs)

Future POM Alternatives *(cont'd)*

▪ Jurisdictional POMs, Option 2

- County and City will be independent POMs to conveyed preserve lands associated with development projects within their respective jurisdiction
- Conveyed lands must be managed and monitored in accordance to the jurisdiction's MSCP Subarea Plan in which the land is located
- City to fund RMP tasks through CFD97-2
- County to establish a CFD or similar funding mechanism to fund RMP tasks once development projects are built within the unincorporated County

Future POM Alternatives *(cont'd)*

- **Pros/Strengths**
- **Cons/Risks**
- **Feasibility**

Future POM Alternatives *(cont'd)*

- **Recommendation**

POM Staff recommends that the PMT support the recommendation to the Policy Committee to direct POM Staff to:

- Meet with the Wildlife Agencies, both regulatory and land management divisions, to obtain their feedback on the POM Alternative descriptions, pros/strengths, and cons/risks of each alternative;
- Outline implementation steps needed to execute each alternative;
- Draft estimated timelines to execute each alternative; and
- Discuss the outcomes for the items listed above with the PMT and Policy Committee at their next regularly scheduled meetings.

V.A. FY08-09 Budget Update

- Beginning FY08/09 Fund Balance = \$378,274
- Estimated Budget for FY08/09 = \$505,500
- Tax Levy for FY08/09 = \$510,339
- Revenues received (as of 01/22/09) = \$213,000
- Second installment is due 04/10/09
- Expenditures to date = \$69,933 (additional expenditures expected before the end of FY 08-09)

V.A. FY08-09 Budget Update *(cont'd)*

- POM Staff identified funding in FY08/09 budget that could be reallocated to other priority tasks
- Working Group Meetings:
 - December 17, 2008
 - January 5, 2009

V.A. FY08-09 Budget Update (cont'd)

- The \$340,000 to be used to complete the following tasks:
 - \$ 10,000 Surveying of an additional 286 acres of suitable CAGN habitat
 - \$ 15,000 Spring floral survey
 - \$ 56,000 Quino survey
 - \$ 8,200 Two additional Herp survey sessions
 - \$ 25,000 Cultural surveys San Ysidro parcel
 - \$ 65,000 On-going biological surveys
 - \$100,000 Updated RMP/Preserve Biologist
 - \$ 60,800 As-needed management and monitoring

V.B. Proposed FY09-10 Budget

- Administrative Costs
- Preserve Operations and Maintenance
- Resource Monitoring Program
- Budget Total
- Levy amount to be calculated
- City Council hearing date to be determined

Task	Projected Expenditures
Administration	
CFD Consultant	\$18,540
City/County Staff Time	
<i>City Staff</i>	
Environmental Manager	\$21,424
Engineering	\$15,450
Counsel	\$5,150
<i>County Staff</i>	
DPR Staff	\$58,000
Counsel	\$4,631
General Services	\$2,830
Administration Total	\$126,025
Preserve Operation and Maintenance	
Park Ranger ¹	\$74,000
Preserve Equipment and Improvements	
Fence Maintenance	\$1,200
Minor Equipment, i.e. Hand/Power Tools	\$2,540
Preserve Operation and Maintenance Total	\$77,740
Resource Monitoring Program	
Baseline Surveys ²	\$202,500
On-Going Surveys ³	\$65,000
Resource Monitoring Program Total	\$267,500
TOTAL FY09-10 (Admin, Maint, and Monitoring)	\$471,265
Carry forward from FY07/08 Resource Monitoring Program ⁴	\$60,000
Carry forward from FY08/09 Resource Monitoring Program ⁵	\$340,000
GRAND TOTAL FY09-10 (Including Carry Forward)	\$871,265

V.C. 5-year Budget Forecast

- Projected POM expenditures and estimated CFD levy amounts through FY2013/2014
- Identifies health of the Reserve over a 5-year period
- Assumptions based on input from City Finance staff and Working Group

VII. Next PMT Meeting

- TBD
- PMT and Policy Committee meetings are scheduled quarterly
- 2009 POM meeting calendar is in the process of being created